APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/292,190	04/15/1999	LUCIANO CHAVEZ JR.	AT9-98-737	3199

7590   02/11/2002

DUKE W YEE
CARSTENS YEE & CAHOON LLP
PO BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2002   5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _THREE_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
  be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this
  communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Jan 8, 2002* .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION.

1.   This is in response to the Response to Office Action filed on 1/8/2002 (paper # 4). Claims

1-22 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3.   Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Wolff et

al., US pat. No.6,044,367.

As to claim 1, Wolff discloses a method for executing a function on a server in a distributed data

processing system, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

receiving a request for a function (I/O functions), wherein the request comprises an input

specifying a server name, wherein the server responds to requests directed to a set of server

names (plurality of servers 104A-106A of fig.1A), and executing the function in a server name

context on the server as directed by the input specifying the server name (see abstract, Figs. 1A,

2A, 3A, col.4 line 14 to col.5 line 67, col.6 line 31 to col.7 line 58).

As to claim 2, Wolff discloses a set of resources (i.e., memory resources) associated with a server

name (see fig.1C, col.7 line 17 to col.8 line 65 and col.10 lines 15-52).

As t o claim 3, Wolff discloses identifying a membership of a resource within the set of

resources for the server name context (see col.6 lines 1-64 and col.7 line 17 to col.8 line 65).

As to claim 4, Wolff discloses generating a server name tag for the server name, wherein the

membership of the resource in the set of resources is identifiable by the server name tag

associatively stored with the resource (see col.6 lines 1-64 and col.7 line 17 to col.8 line 65).

As to claim 5, Wolff discloses the server name tag is generated based on a value of the server

name and a value derived from a data structure that stores the server name (see fig.1B, col.5 line

56 to col.8 line 24 and col.15 line 61 to col.16 line 45).

As to claim 6, Wolff discloses the value derived from the data structure is a position value of

the server name within a server name table that stores the set of server names (see fig.5A-B,

col.19 line 32 to col.21 line 33 and col.23 lines 12-54).

As to claim 7, Wolff discloses the request for the function is received from a network (see

fig1A).

As to claim 8, Wolff discloses locating the server name in an entry of a server name table; obtaining a location index for the entry; and generating a server name mask based on the location index (see tables 6, 7, col.17 line 43 to col.18 line 36 and col.33 line 9 to col.35 line 33).

As to claim 9, Wolff discloses generating a server name mask based on the server retrieving a server name mask for a resource from a resource data structure and comparing the generated server name mask with the retrieved server name mask to identify whether the resource is applicable to the server name (see fig.5B, col.20 line 33 to col.22 line 44).

As to claim 10, Wolff discloses repeatedly identifying a plurality of resources that are applicable to the server name by searching plurality of resource data structures for matching server name masks (see fig.5B, col.20 line 33 to col.22 line 44).

As to claim 11, Wolff discloses server name masks is a bitwise AND operation (i.e., Boolean function, see fig.10B, col.30 line 62 to col.31 line 65).

Claims 12-20 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1-6, 8, 9, 10 respectively.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 2 respectively.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed on 1/8/2002 have been fully considered but they are found

not persuasive.

        * Applicant asserts that the Wolff reference does not disclose the server responding to

requests directed to a set of server names and executing the function in a server name context on

the server as directed by the input specifying the server name.

        *Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wolff clearly discloses the server responding to

requests directed to a set of server names and executing the function in a server name context on

the server as directed by the input specifying the server name (i.e., using some administrative

servers such as 104B and 106B of fig.1A to handle requests from normal client 100A, then the

server 106B passes the I/O request via a path to the administration server, see fig.1A, 1B, 2A,

col.4 line 14 to col.5 line 67 and col.6 line 31 to col.7 line 58).*

        * *In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is

based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on

obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so

long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the

time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the*

applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392,

170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

*   Therefore, the examiner asserts that Wolff teaches or suggests the subject matter*

broadly recited in indepenedent claims 1, 12 and 21 as required under 35 U.S.C 102(e). Claims

2-11, 13-20 and 22 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims1,

12 and 21 and by other reasons set forth in the previous Office Action (paper #3, mailed on

8/28/2001)

Conclusion

5.   Claims 1-22 are *rejected.*

6.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for this

group are:

After Final:	(703) 746-7239
Official:	(703) 746-7239
Non-Official/ Draft:	(703) 746-7240

        Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2155
1/28/2002

DAVID WILEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER